1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Rossana Baeza (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) 100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor Miami, FL 33131 Tel.: (305) 539-8400 jlee@bsfllp.com rbaeza@bsfllp.com Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334	SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P. Bill Carmody (admitted pro hac vice) Shawn J. Rabin (admitted pro hac vice) Steven M. Shepard (admitted pro hac vice) Alexander Frawley (admitted pro hac vice) 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor New York, NY 10019 Tel.: (212) 336-8330 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com srabin@susmangodfrey.com sshepard@susmangodfrey.com afrawley@susmangodfrey.com  Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel.: (310) 789-3100 abonn@susmangodfrey.com  MORGAN & MORGAN John A. Yanchunis (admitted pro hac vice) Ryan J. McGee (admitted pro hac vice) 201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor Tampa, FL 33602 Tel.: (813) 223-5505 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com rmcgee@forthepeople.com
17 18	Tel.: (213) 995-5720 alanderson@bsfllp.com	Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500 San Francisco, CA 94102 Tel: (415) 358-6913 mram@forthepeople.com
19		mam@formepcopic.com
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
21	CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,	Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK
22	JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
23	individually and on behalf of all similarly situated,	GOOGLE'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY
24	Plaintiffs,	D. f 1. Th. II. 11. C V. 1
25	VS.	Referral: The Honorable Susan van Keulen
26	GOOGLE LLC,	
27	Defendant.	
28		

1	Before the Court is Google's Motion for Leave to File Sur-Reply (Dkt. 735, Google's		
2	"Motion"), to which Plaintiffs responded in opposition (Dkt). Having considered the parties		
3	papers filed in support of and in opposition to Google's Motion, and all other matters properly		
4	considered by this Court, the Court <b>DENIES</b> Google's Motion.		
5	As an initial matter, Google cites no rule permitting its requested relief. Google sought n		
6	stipulation from Plaintiffs, so Google's filing is therefore not an administrative motion. Civil L.R		
7	7-11(a).		
8	After a reply is filed, only two situations permit additional filings: (1) objection to reply		
9	evidence; or (2) a relevant judicial opinion published therafter and without argument. Civil L.R.		
10	7-3(d). Neither applies here. Google neither objected to any reply evidence nor cited any new law		
11	Even if construed as an objection, it would be untimely. Civil L.R. 7-3(d)(1) (objection required		
12	within seven days). Nevertheless, "[s]urreplies are disfavored and the Court routinely reject		
13	them." Buffin v. City and County of San Francisco, 2016 WL 2606865, *1 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2016		
14	(Gonzalez Rogers, J.). Seeking to address "erroneous assertions" does not necessarily justify a sur		
15	reply. Banga v. First USA, NA, 29 F. Supp. 3d 1270, 1276 (N.D. Cal. 2014).		
16	Google has not demonstrated that a sur-reply is warranted. Google's Motion mostly restate		
17	its arguments made in opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for supplemental discovery sanctions (Dkts		
18	656, 696). The Court disregards those impermissible restatements in Google's proposed sur-reply		
19	Where Google did address a document that Plaintiffs first cited in their reply brief (Dkt. 708), that		
20	document did not raise a new matter for consideration, but instead was offered in support o		
21	arguments Plaintiffs previously made in their opening papers (Dkt. 656) and addressed by Google		
22	in its opposition (Dkt. 696). Google has failed to demonstrate that Plaintiffs' reply raised any new		
23	arguments not raised in the opening papers.		
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
25	DATED:		
26	Honorable Susan van Keulen United States Magistrate Judge		
27	Silited States Mage		
28			